



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

27

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,393	11/29/2000	Arnab Das	3-9-56	9723

22046 7590 07/11/2003

LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
DOCKET ADMINISTRATOR
101 CRAWFORDS CORNER ROAD - ROOM 3J-219
HOLMDEL, NJ 07733

EXAMINER

MYERS, PAUL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2189

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/725,393

Applicant(s)

DAS ET AL.

Examiner

Paul R. Myers

Art Unit

2189

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5, 7.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

All claims use either the term encoder packet or encoder sub-packet. The examiner does not know what an encoder packet is. The term encoder packet is present in the specification however it is not defined therein either. The examiner searched multiple sources including consultation with other examiners for a possible definition of this term in the art however the examiner was unable to find a definition of this term. The examiner will therefore assume it is a packet that is encoded. Clarification of this term is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2189

4. Claims 1, 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bruckman PN 2002/0051466.

In regards to claims 1, 18, 20-21 and 23: Bruckman teaches channel coding packets to produce channel coded packets (See abstract); and puncturing (fragmenting) and/or repeating (transmitting) the channel coded packets to produce a first sub-packet (fragment) having a first size based on a size of the packet and a first data transmission rate at which the first sub-packet is to be transmitted (See abstract and paragraph 0026).

In regards to claim 3: Bruckman et al teaches recombining the sub-packets (by reassembler 34).

In regards to claims 4-5: Bruckman et al teaches the size of each fragment being individually determined and the size being variable within a range since packets are digital the sizes have only a discrete number of possibilities. Thus Bruckman et al teaches both the fragments being different sizes and the fragments being of the same sizes.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruckman PN 2002/0051466 in view of Sayeed et al PN 5,828,677.

Art Unit: 2189

In regards to claims 2 and 14-16: Bruckman teaches the dynamic transmission rate control above. Bruckman et al also teaches the first data transmission rate is based on first measured channel conditions however these conditions are measured at the front end not the receiver. Sayeed et al teaches the common method of measuring channel conditions at the receiver and feeding that information back to the transmitter to adjust transmission characteristics (see column 6 lines 53-62). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the receiver condition measurements because this would have allowed for considering the entire channel not just a small part.

In regards to claims 17, 19 and 22: Sayeed et al teaches the use of Nak messages.

7. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bruckman PN 2002/0051466 in view of Buchholz et al PN 5,337,313.

In regards to claims 6-7: Bruckman teaches the dynamic packet size and rate as described above. Bruckman teaches adding a packet start and a packet end in accordance with the FRF.12 protocol instead of adding a packet size identifier. Bruckman states that while the invention is described in conjunction with the FRF.12 protocol it is not to be limited to that protocol. Bruckman also gives an example of the ATM protocol which includes a five-byte header but does not give details of the header information. Buchholz et al teaches a packet reassembly header (406) that includes a packet length field (660). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a packer size identifier because this would have allowed for the receiver front end to handle packet reassembly more efficiently.

Art Unit: 2189

In regards to claims 8 and 12: Bruckman teaches transmitting the fragments based upon their individual transmission rates however Bruckman does not expressly teach modulating the data. Official notice is taken that modulating data to transmit data is well known. For example Modems which stand for Modulator/demodulator. It would have been obvious to modulate the data because this would have allowed for the use of standard modems which have the advantage of having good resistance to noise on the wire.

In regards to claims 9 and 13: Bruckman states that it is not required to inform the receiver of the transmission rate however it is advantageous to provide the rate information to the receiver/reassembler paragraph 0027.

In regards to claims 10-11: Buchholz et al teaches a protocol field that indicate the packet protocol.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 703 305 9656. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 703 305 4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 746 7239 for regular communications and 703 746 7239 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2189

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 3900.

PRM

July 9, 2003


PAUL R. MYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER